

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JULIAN ANDREW TORRES,

Plaintiff,

v.

EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES,  
LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-01138-JLT-EPG

ORDER DENYING JOINT MOTION FOR A  
PROTECTIVE ORDER WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE

(ECF Nos. 27, 28)

On March 13, 2025, the parties filed a joint motion for the Court<sup>1</sup> to enter a protective order. (ECF No. 27). The joint motion will be denied, without prejudice, because it does not comply with Local Rule 141.1.

Local Rule 141.1(c) requires that every proposed protective order contain the following provisions:

(1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child);

(2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and

(3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court

<sup>1</sup> Although the parties submitted an agreed protective order for Magistrate Judge Orberto, she entered an order of recusal on January 24, 2025. (ECF No. 24). This case was then reassigned to the undersigned.

1 order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.  
2 LR 141.1(c)(1)-(3).

3 Regarding Local Rule 141.1(c)(1)-(2), the parties have failed to provide an adequate  
4 description of the types of information eligible for protection and a particularized showing of  
5 need for protection as to each category of information covered by their proposed order. The  
6 parties' proposed protective order defines "confidential" information to mean "a document  
7 reasonably designated as confidential under this protective order[.]" (ECF No. 27 at 2). The  
8 proposed protective order states: "[a] party or non-party disclosing or producing a document may  
9 designate it as confidential if the party or non-party reasonably contends that it contains  
10 confidential or proprietary information." (*Id.* at 3). Additionally, the memorandum in support of  
11 the motion states: "the Parties seek an *umbrella* protective order which permits them to designate  
12 certain information as confidential." (ECF No. 28 at 2 (emphasis added)).

13 Such a catchall description is not sufficient "in general terms [] to reveal the nature of the  
14 information" under LR 141.1(c)(1). For example, the parties do not generally identify  
15 "confidential" information to include, *e.g.*, a customer list or some other descriptor to reveal the  
16 general type of information deemed confidential. Likewise, the parties fail to make a  
17 particularized showing as to need for protection as to any category of information to be covered  
18 by the order under LR 141.1(c)(2). The parties also do not explain why the request for protection  
19 "should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the  
20 parties." LR 141.1(c)(3).

21 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties' joint motion for protective order (ECF  
22 No. 27) is denied, without prejudice.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: March 18, 2025

25 /s/ Eric P. Gray  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28